DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 147 037 PS 009 709

AUTHOR McCormick, Francis Michael
TITLE A Comparative Evaluation of State Day Care Personnel Standards.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 63p.; Master's Thesis, University of Wisconsin (Madison) ; Tables on pages 39-56 may be marginally legible due to quality of print

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Ability Identification; Child Care Workers; *Comparative Analysis; *Day Care Services; *Early Childhood Education; Educational Background; Evaluation Criteria; Health; Personality; Personnel Evaluation; *Personnel Selection; Qualifications; *Standards; *State Legislation; Surveys; Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT

This master's thesis presents a survey of state standards for day care personnel using data gathered from copies of general state day care requirements. Requirements for day care teachers are organized into five categories: health, education, abilities, personality and extraneous variables. Five questions are asked in the survey concerning minimal state requirements, most frequently mentioned specific and general requirements, personality requirements and whether a set of personality traits could be identified from survey responses. The survey indicated that standards were highly variable across states. Among other results, the survey indicated a ranking of priorities across states. Health, education, extraneous, personality and ability ranked from most to least important as state concerns. Although previous research had indicated the importance of personality variables in teacher performance, these traits were not emphasized in many state requirements. Important personality traits mentioned most frequently, however, included Good Character, Understanding and Emotional Maturity. Tables are presented which allow comparisons of specific and general requirements across states. Relevant research and historical data on day care are also reviewed. (BD)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED147037

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A COMPARATIVE EVALUATION OF STATE DAY CARE PERSONNEL STANDARDS

BY

FRANCIS MICHAEL MCCORMICK

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Educational Psychology

at the

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - MADISON

1977

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Francis Michael McCormick
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

PS 009709

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I - Introduction and Literature Review	1
II - Method	16
Design	16
III - Results	19
IV - Discussion and Summary	26
Tables	34
Table I	35
Table II	36
Table III	37
Table IV	38
Table V	39
Table VI	40
Table VII	48
Table VIII	50
References	52
Appendix A	55

Approved _____

Date May 27, 1977

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Without the guidance, understanding, and patience of Professor John Giebink, this work would not have been completed. I would especially like to thank the Department of Family and Social Services for all their time and resources (the State Day Care Requirements' Manuals from around the country), which made the whole process of state day care licensing and revisioning more understandable; thus clearing the way for my National Survey of State Day Care Teacher Requirements.

I find it difficult to find the words to thank my wife Kathleen who has shared in the ups and downs of my program. Besides her emotional support, her consulted advice on this thesis was invaluable.

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The day care issue pinnacled with the introduction of the "Comprehensive Child Development amendment to the 1971 Office of Economic Opportunity bill." The bill passed through Congress but was vetoed by President Nixon. The presence of the bill on Capital Hill made it the target of much controversy. The very purpose of day care was questioned. Similarly, the who, what, when and where of day care became questions (Roby, 1975, Pp. 74-77). Exactly where one might search for some clear and precise answers seemed unclear. The day care requirements of each state ought to reflect the condition of current day care, since the day care centers of each state should conform to the established state requirements. Hollick notes that:

> ".....all DAY CARE regulations probably reflect our society's intent to assure the safety and well-being of children in day care."
> (Hollick, 1972, Foreword)

A brief review of the history of day care appears necessary before surveying state regulations for day care teachers. Day care in the United States dates back at least as far as the turn of the nineteenth century. Known as the infant schools of New England, day care institutions were founded by the so-called charitable people, in order to accommodate the children of the poor. The infant school concentrated on the cultivation of the child's mind (Fein and Clarke-Stewart, 1973, p. 13). A.L. Kuhn (1947) quoted an article written in the 1830's, indicating that its readers should experience compassion for the

> ".....poor little ones who have no nursery and no mother deserving the name, and not to rest until every section of the city has its infant school.... women know more than men do how much may be done towards forming the mental health and especially the moral character during the first four years of a child's life (p.27)."

The first regulatory provisions governing child care came about with the development of the State Board of Charity in Massachusetts in 1863. The board's function was to report on (not license) certain types of child care facilities (Class,1968, p.56). By 1873, seven more states established a state board of charity (for the complete list see Appendix A). In 1884, the New York Board of Charity was given the authority to enforce the ruling that a child was to be removed from a subsidized institution if the care given to the child was ruled as insufficient (Class, 1968, p.56).

The day nursery arose following the infant school era. The first known United States day nursery was opened in Boston in 1838 by Mrs. Joseph Hale. The purpose of her nursery was to care for the children of seamens' wives and widows (Kerr, 1973, p.158). During the Civil War, a nursery school was opened to care for the children of those women working in factories and hospitals (Beer, 1970).

The year 1885 witnessed the licensing of child care facilities for the first time. This Philadelphia law stated that:

> "Any person, other than an institution duly incorporated for the purpose, who shall engage in the business of receiving, boarding or keeping infant children under the age of three years for hire or reward, who shall receive or take for such purpose more than two such children without having first obtained a license in writing to do so from the mayor of the town or a justice of the peace or a magistrate of the locality wherein such child is to be received, boarded or kept, shall be

> guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof, shall be sentenced to pay a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars. (Laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, No.30, Section 2).

Massachusetts followed suit in 1892, by requiring anyone boarding two or more infants under the age of two years to seek licensing by the State Board of Lunacy and Charity (Class, 1968, p.58).

A model day nursery was set up at the Worlds Fair in Chicago in 1893. This model day nursery cared for over ten thousand children brought by the visitors (Kerr, 1973, p.158). This exposure of day care to such a large sample of the United States populace apparently led to an increase in day care programs. By 1898, the number of day nurseries in the United States grew to approximately 175 (Kerr, 1973, p.158). This large figure warranted the establishment of a "National Federation of Day Nurseries." The purpose for establishing this organization was the hope "to unite in one central body all day nurseries and the endeavor to secure the highest attainable standard of merit" (National Society for the Study of Education, 1929,p.15).

Originally, nurseries were custodial holding programs, where physical care and protection from environmental hazards were the only goals (Beer, 1970, Pp. 15-30). However, there were nurseries at the turn of the century that went out of their way to also provide activities for the children in their charge and to help their parents solve any problems that were brought to their attention (Kerr, 1973, p. 158).

The majority of day care nurseries were serving immigrant families. One of the goals for the day nursery was to socialize the children. Jane Addams accentuated this point when discussing her Hull House

day nursery:

> "It is now carried on by the United Charities of Chicago in a finely equipped building on our block, where the immigrant mothers are cared for as well as the children and where they are taught the things which will make life in America more possible" (1910,p.169).

This educational goal was again seen in California in 1910 when the first public school nursery was opened as the result of a compulsory school law. These nursery school programs were organized "to begin proper education and to Americanize foreign children" (National Society for the Study of Education, 1929, p. 90).

The National Conference of Charities and Correction was created in 1873. It exerted a great deal of pressure for the support of state regulation of private agencies, and especially those dealing with child care (Class, 1968, p.58).

The first White House Conference on the care of dependent children commenced in 1909. The conclusion reached by this conference was that care for a child in his own home was the ideal. However, if a child required placement in an institution, the institution should follow the cottage plan. In addition, recommendations were made to the states that they officially inspect regularly all the agencies dealing with dependent children and that they create a state board that would regulate the incorporation of new agencies (Children's Bureau, 1967, Pp. 4-5).

A real asset to the child care movement was the formation of the United States Children's Bureau in 1912. The formation of the Children's Bureau was the result of the thirteenth recommendation from the

White House Conference of Dependent Children in 1909 (Children's Bureau, 1967, p.5). A reflection of their actions can be seen in their urging the establishment of standards for a variety of child care agencies, and for the organizing of children's code commisions and child welfare committees in the various states (Class, 1968, p.58).

The Child Welfare League of America came into existence in 1920. Through research projects, community organization, and consultation, they were able to develop a set of standards for the different types of child care. They also established close cooperative relationships with local, state, and national agencies (Class, 1968, Pp. 58-59).

The Child Welfare League of America (CWLA) attracted from its inception the nursery school professional who assisted the CWLA in defining the two major types of child care: nursery school and day nursery (Kerr, 1973, p. 161). The nursery school concerns itself with the education of the child, whereas the day nursery is a service for families exhibiting some type of social pathology (Kerr, 1973,p.161). According to Ethel Beer, the nursery movement seemed to be making positive effective strides as reflected in the nursery school, but the day nursery, because of its long hours, understaffing and poor facilities was giving the whole movement a rather disturbing image (1942, p. 27). During the 1930 White House Conference, the Education and Training Task Force prognosis regarding the day nursery was very favorable (White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, 1931, p. 10).

Unemployment for many nursery school teachers arose with the onslaught of the depression in the 1930's. In 1933, President

Roosevelt authorized the Works Progress Administration which created jobs for nursery school teachers by federally subsidizing the opening of nursery schools for the care of needy children (Kerr, 1973, p. 162). This program left an indelible mark on the nursery school movement through its administrative methods. The fundings alloted were to be administered and directed through state departments of education and not through the welfare departments. This step altered the day care movement by moving its association from the sole role of welfare to one including education and child development (Kerr, 1973, p. 162).

Norris Class suggests that the passage of the Social Security Act of 1935, was the turning point for child care licensing. The passage of this act meant Federal grant-in-aid funds would be given to the states, in order to strengthen and expand welfare services to children. This funding allowed the states to acquire better personnel in the child care facilities, the administration levels, and on the licensing level (1968, p.59).

A need for women to work in industry surfaced upon the entrance of the United States into Work War II. When women initially joined the industrial work force during World War II, it was not uncommon to see bands of children roaming the streets or younger ones locked in cars (Kerr, 1973, p. 163). Day care seemed to be an unavoidable solution. The United States War Manpower Commission made the following declaration in 1942; " the first responsibility of women, in war, as in peace, is to give suitable care in their own homes to their children," and they further added that industrial management should make every allowance possible for mothers with children, and if possible to

establish day care facilities wherever and whenever they are able to do so (Monthly labor review, 1942, p. 1184).

Public Law 137, better known as the Lanham or Community Facilities Act was enacted in June,1942. Initially, the bill was passed "to provide for the acquisition and equipment of public works made necessary by the defense program." Two months later, in August, 1942, an added interpretation indicated that day care centers in war related industrial areas could be considered public works (Kerr, 1973, p. 163).

It was assumed that the women would return home as house-wives and mothers at the end of World War II, and the husbands could again resume their place in industry. Thus, the Lanham Act was to terminate at the end of the war and did so on February 28, 1946 (Kerr, 1973, p. 165).

Nine different organizations appealed to the President to continue the provisions of the Lanham Act but to no avail (Kerr, 1973, p. 165). All the Lanham Act Centers were closed, except in one state - California. California was fortunate to have housed the Lanham Act Centers in their public school facilities. The California Legislature voted, in 1946, to arrange two-to-one matching funds which were granted on a year to year basis until 1957, when the state voted permanent funding (Prescott, et. al., 1969, p. 26).

Propagandizing followed the closing of the Lanham day care centers. Magazines expounded upon the normalcy of the mother- at - home and upon the problems associated with war orphans who were being institutionalized. This propagandizing was not totally effective since many mothers preferred to remain in the work force, and so the need for day care centers continued (Kerr, 1973, p.166).

Hope for the refunding of day care centers rose when the Korean War broke out. To the surprise of most people, Congress passed the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act in 1951. This bill granted loans or grants for community facilities, including day care. However, in the appropriation of funds, day care was generally neglected.

Along with the Korean War came the popular fear of communism. Since day care was an essential element in the Russian system of industry and Government, the American people seemed to associated day care with communism and looked upon day care with disfavor. (Kerr, 1973, p. 166).

A soltuion to the basic need for child care had not yet been provided. In 1940, there were 1.5 million mothers in the work force; by 1950, there were 4.6 million mothers employed; by 1959, there were 7.5 million; in 1970, 12 million; and in 1975, there were 14 million mothers working (America's Children, 1976).

The sixth White House Conference on Children and Youth convened in 1960. The conference concluded with eight recommended resolutions. In summary, two of the eight recommended that mothers with children should stay at home unless work is absolutely necessary. Another two suggested that both government and industry establish day care centers for working mothers. Two more resolutions recommended that the government expand the present nursery school for all children at all economic levels. The seventh resolution advocated family day care for children under three, and the eighth resolution recommended that at least one individual in every center have early childhood education training

(Kerr, 1973, p.167). In analyzing these White House Conference resolutions, Virginia Kerr made the following statement:

> "The resolutions reflected the tradition of regarding the nursery school as a positive experience and day care as an unpleasant necessity and highlighted the ambivalence that accompanied attempts to merge the two services (1973, p. 167)."

Funds for day care were provided in 1962 when the Social Sercurity Act was amended. The funds were to be administered by the state departments of welfare. In 1967, the Social Security Act was amended again, so that there would be seventy-five percent Federal funding for day care of children of past, present, and potential welfare users. Each state was given the power to define who those recipients were (Kerr, 1973, p. 167).

The Economic Opportunity Act (EOA) provided funds in 1964, for a new creative project titled Head Start. The purpose of this program was to combat poverty (Kerr, 1973, p. 167). The goal for this program was to provide compensatory education for disadvantaged children (Kerr, 1973, p. 167). Funds were also provided by EOA for day care services for the children of migrant workers. Various manpower projects which included funds for day care were also funded by the EOA (Kerr, 1973, p. 167).

The Housing and Urban Development Act, Title VII, assisted day care centers both technically and financially in 1965. For a city demonstration program, the Model Cities Act of 1966 provided for a number of day care projects. Using Head Start monies Parent and Child Centers (PCC) for children under three were set up as demonstrations, thus breaking a long history of the prohibition of infant centers.

Along with that previously mentioned 1967 amendment to the Social Security Act came the Work Incentive Program (WIN). Under the WIN program, the children of the participating parents would be provided day care (Kerr, 1973, Pp. 167-168).

Basic interest in child care outside the home prior to the 1960's experienced extreme ups and downs. The concept of day care became nationally prominent during times of national emergency, such as war times and economic depression. Both during and in between national emergencies there has been a continuous undercurrent of persevering individuals and organizations seeking to expand and improve the day care concept.

Day care has made a transition over the past two-hundred years. Initially day care served the poor or neglected child on the custodial level. With the passage of time, day care expanded its commitments by serving the middle and upper classes. This expansion also included a change of philosophy. Day care moved from its predominantly custodial role to that of educational.

Day care in the United States over the past two centuries can be found tied to the grass roots of the country in a way similar to other institutions that affect the community and the country so greatly. There have been moves toward greater community support, control, and organization. Policy making has followed a slow and hesitant path dealing with day care. Prior to 1960 very little attention and legislation focused on day care.

National attention from both the legislators and the people focused sporadically on day care during the 1960's. By the mid

sixties there were sixty federal programs dealing with day care. Each federal program had its own system and each one varied in terms of its goals and each bill developed its own vertical system. As a result in the present arrangement, there is very little inter-institutional information exchange and a good deal of duplication. Among the various agencies set up to deal with the variety of day care programs and policies one problem seems to lie in the fact that there are so many varied interest groups, all going in their own different directions. Pamela Roby refers to this situation as the "nonsystem" (1973, p. 134).

It seems that this term, nonsystem, could easily describe the whole apparatus of day care in the United States. In order to review the specific characteristics of this nonsystem, it would seem appropriate to survey the present status of day care regulations as they represent the mix of state commitments. There have been a numbers of surveys completed which offer necessary and important information and permit us to develop a systematic analysis of the nonsystem.

There are three relevant national surveys of day care regulatory policy. The first, "A Survey of State Day Care Licensing Requirements," offers two important contributions; one, is the definition of day care licensing in fine detail; and the second is the overall survey of the day care requirements for licensing from all the states and Washington, D.C. (Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc.,1971). This particular survey deals with the day care requirements from a broad and general perspective. This first survey examines the day care teacher on only two counts - the education of the teacher and the child/staff ratio.

The second survey is "Abstracts of State Day Care Licensing Requirements. Part 2: Day Care Centers." (Office of Child Development (DHEW), 1971). In this second survey all the state day care requirements are presented in abstract form from every state and Washington, D.C. This second survey is useful since the essence of each day care requirement for each state is presented. However, the presentation format does not allow for an easy comparison of the various requirements from all the states nor does it allow for ease of analyses regarding such issues as the possibility of overlapping requirements from the various states.

The third survey is "A Comparison of Provisions in State and Federal Standards for Institutional Day Care," (Central Midwestern Regional Lab., 1972). On a yes/no format, this third survey included the following; pre-employment physical; minimum age required; minimum education; responsibilities specified; annual physical; and child/staff ratio. Regulations affecting the day care teacher are surveyed in some detail, but the survey avoids analysis which could better inform us of the mixed characteristics of state systems.

The principle advantage of all three surveys is that they gather information which presents a national picture and which can be reviewed in its bulk form. This survey method serves as an essential first step. The next step should provide for a rigorous analysis of all the day care requirements in order to provide a closer and more microscopic view of each regulatory policy in day care.

In this study it was decided to analyze in depth that segment of day care regulations dealing with personnel standards. This decision

was based on statements such as the following:

1) Teachers are the most important factor in any group experience for your children (Pitcher, 1968);

2) The benefits children derived from nursery school will be influenced to a large degree by the personality and competence of the teacher (Jersild, 1960);

3) It is the personality of the teacher, her outlook and convictions, that constitute the most important single factor in shaping the child's nursery experience (Reichenberg-Hackett, 1962).

A specific and conceptually significant issue regarding teachers and caregivers involves the personality question. According to two of the three statements quoted, the teachers personality should be a major determinant of performance as a teacher (Jersild, 1960); Reichenberg-Hackett, 1962). Personality encompasses a large spectrum and it is important to identifying those traits or characteristics that have either been thought or demonstrated to be influential in the behavior of the day care teacher.

Research has suggested the nature of certain relationships between a variety of personality traits and their effects on children. The teacher's emotional warmth can bring about (for the children): increases in IQ (Eisenberg and Connors, 1966; Pierce-Jones and Strodtbeck in O'Brian and Lopate, 1968): creativity (Sears and Hilgard, 1964): a liking for the teacher (Prescott, et al., 1967): and constructive and productive behavior (Ryans, 1964). A teacher's understanding, sensitivity and responsiveness, are associated with children's productive behavior (Ryan, 1964).

Flexibility is generally seen to be a desired characteristic of day care teachers (Harvey, et al., 1966; Spaulding, 1964; Flanders,

1964; Jones, 1970). A day care teacher should allow a child to express his/her feelings, behavior, independence, and creativity (Flanders, 1964; Harvey, et al., 1966; Jones, 1970). A teacher who is careful of the quality of his/her verbal behavior has a greater chance of bringing out positive responses (Swift, 1964). According to Fein and Clarke-Stewart, the characteristics to look for in a good day care teacher are emotional warmth, understanding, sensitivity, responsiveness, flexibility, and willingness to become involved with children (1973, p. 242).

If the general theory that teachers are critical factors in the child's experience is valid, they should be considered in regulatory policy. Therefore the information from the day care requirement manuals that deserves analysis would be concerning the day care teacher's personal characteristics. This decision led to the five questions we seek to answer in this study:

1) What are the minimal personnel regulations for day care teachers as found in the state day care regulations?

2) Which state day care teachers' regulations are considered most important by the states?

3) What general area of the state day care regulations for teachers do all the states consider most important?

4) How do the states perceive the personality of the day care teacher?

5) In reviewing the personality characteristics cited in regulations from across the fifty states, is there a set of personality traits that surfaces?

Our brief perusal of the history of day care and its regulations reveals that day care suffers from massive disorganization which is

best described by the term "nonsystem." Since in practive the major determinant of program quality in day care is the state regulatory code, a good place to start our analysis of this nonsystem is to survey the current status of day care as mirrored in the day care requirements across the states.

Chapter II

METHODS

Current state day care regulationswere acquired from each state and Washington, D.C. The day care requirements from each state had already been collected by the Department of Health and Social Services - Family Divison in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, in 1975. They were being used in rewriting the State of Wisconsin's Day Care Regulations. In order to economize on time, permission was sought and granted for using them for this project. Although the day care regulations for each state cover all aspects of day care, only the requirements for the day care teacher were extracted for this analysis. These particular requirements were further organized into five subcategories: 1) Health; 2) Education; 3) Abilities; 4) Personality; and 5) Extraneous (this particular order was chosen so that the first letter from each group constitutes the acronym HEAPE).

The first of the five question being asked in this study is:

> 1) What are the minimal personnel regulations for day care teachers as found in the state day care regulations?

In order to answer this question a matrix was constructed with the states listed alphabetically on the ordinate, while the day care requirements from all the states were arranged on the abscissa. This organization has 3 advantages; 1) the day care requirements for a teacher for each state can be easily located; 2) the duplication of requirements is eliminated; and 3) there is a clear picture of which day care requirements are chosen most frequently.

The day care regulations were further ordered into subjective subgroups which should assist in the overall view of all the regulations. The regulations were further subordered by subjectively determining where similarities among regulations existed.

The second question being asked in this study is:

> 2) Which state day care teachers' requirements are considered most important by the states?

In order to respond to this question each category of HEAPE was studied individually. The importance of each day care teacher regulations was determined by the number of states choosing the regulation. The more frequently a regulation was chosen by the various states, the more important it became. The number of states choosing a particular requirement were summed and percentages were tallied. Thus each category shows day care requirements which are considered relatively more important by the states.

The third questions being asked in this study is:

> 3) What general area of the state day care requirements for teachers do all the states consider most important?

In order to answer this question the categories of HEAPE were ranked in order of importance. To accomplish this, the percentage of requirements chosen by each state in each category were listed under each respective category. A ranking system was established so that all percentages between 0 and 10 = 1; 10 to 20 =2; 20 to 30 = 3; 30 to 40= 4; and 40 to 50 = 5. These ranks were summed and the mean was established for each category.

The fourth question being asked in this study is:

> 4) How does each state perceive the personality

of the day care teacher?

In order to respond to this question, the Personality category from the National Survery HEAPE was utilized. The states are listed on the ordinate and the personality traits from the states are listed on the abscissa. Thus the personality traits considered important by each state can be readily located and associated.

The fifth and final question being asked in this study is:

> 5) In reviewing the personality characteristics cited in regulations from across the fifty states, is there a set of personality traits that surfaces?

Question five is seeking a particular personality trait whose importance is determined by the number of states choosing it. The procedure for finding this particular personality trait was a matter of taking the Personality section of the HEAPE Survey and establishing the percentage of states that chose each personality trait.

Chapter III

RESULTS

There are five questions to be answered. Each one will be presented and then answered in succession.

The first question was:

1) What are the minimal personnel regulations for day care teachers as found in the state day care regulations?

The number and variety of day care regulations are extant. Organization was established by placing each regulation into one of the five catagories of HEAPE. Each state chose its own particular pattern of regulations (no two are exactly alike). The total number of different regulations is 119. According to each section of HEAPE, there are 26 regulations in the Health section; 14 in Education; 27 in the Abilities; 43 in Personality and 9 in Extraneous. Examples from the Health section are; Physical Required; Tuberculosis Test; No Alcoholism. Examples from the Education section are; College Degree; Experience; Able to Read and Write. Examples from the Abilities section are; Able to Praise Children; Provide Adequate Care; Suitable to work with Children. Examples from the Personality section are; Mature; Reliable; Effective. Examples from the Extraneous section are; Orientation to Program; Work References; As Directed by Director.

There is duplication in the HEAPE Survey. For example, Humbly Teachable and Willing to Learn appear to be one in the same. In order to retain the exact wording of many of the requirements the similar

regulations were not combined. No judgement concerning the regulations' quality nor necessity was made in order to avoid subjectivity and personal bias.

However, the day care teacher regulations were subjectively ordered into subcategories within each section of HEAPE, where they each had an element of similarity. Each of the subcategories comprised groups of specifics that could be placed under one regulation. For example, in the Health section there are six subcategories in total. In subcategory II, there are the following regulations; Physically Strong; Healthy; Freedom from Physical Disability - Blindness - Deafness - Epilepsy; all these requirements could be easily described by the term Healthy.

In the Education section, there are four subcategories. Subcategory number III ranges from "Able to Read and Write" to "Some College." These two regulations could neatly fit under the regulation Formal Education.

The Abilities section reveals seven subcategories. An example from this section is subcategory number V. Humbly Teachable; Willing to Learn; and Able to Accept Supervision could be grouped under the one title Willing to Learn.

The Personality section can be subgrouped into ten subcategories. An example of combinations is subcategory number IV - Mature and Emotional Maturity. Both of these regulations could have been described by the one regulation - Mature.

The section Extraneous could not be subgrouped. The whole purpose for this subgrouping was an additional attempt to place order into the day care regulations. This particular procedure of subgrouping has

been used with the knowledge of the bias that is present from personal interpretations of the regulations. For a summary of all the data collected to answer question one, see Tables I; II; III; IV; and V.

The second question was:

> 2) Which state day care teacher regulations are considered most important by all the states?

This second question was answered in several ways. For each section of HEAPE, the number of states choosing a particular regulation were summed and percentages were tallied for each. The importance of each regulation was judged on the basis of the number of states choosing that regulation.

In the Health section there are eight regulations that had been chosen by one state for each; there are two regulations that had been chosen by twenty-eight states and the top three regulations chosen most frequently were Physically Strong, which was chosen by thirty-eight states; Tuberculosis Test was chosen by forty-four states; and the most important regulation from the Health section was Physical Required, which was chosen by forty-six states.

In the Education section there were four regulations that were chosen by one state for each. The top three regulations included Experience, which was chosen by fifteen states; Inservice Training, which was chosen by fifteen states; and the most important regulation from the Education section, High School Degree, which was chosen by twenty-eight states.

There were thirteen regulations that were chosen by only one state each in the Abilities section. There was one regulation that was

chosen by six states. The top three regulations were; Able to Stimulate Normal Development, which was chosen by ten different states; Able to Accept Differences Amongst Children, which was chosen by eleven states; and the most important regulation from the Abilities section was Able to be Firm but Nonpunitive with Out-of-Bounds Behavior, which was chosen by twelve states.

There were nine regulations from the Personality section that were chosen by only one state for each. There was one regulation chosen by nine states. The top three regulations were; Emotional Maturity which was chosen by twelve states; Understanding which was chosen by eighteen states and the most important regulation from the Personality section was Good Character which was chosen by twenty-four of the states.

There were four regulations from the Extraneous section that were chosen by one state for each. There were three regulations that were chosen by two states. The top two regulations were; Free from Past Crimes in Child Abuse or Moral Turpitudes, which was chosen by twelve states; and the most important regulation from the Extraneous section was Character Reference which was chosen by fourteen states. For a summary of all the data answering question two, see Table VI.

Question number three was:

> 3) What general area of the state day care regulations for teachers do all the states consider most important?

The total number of regulations for each section of HEAPE were tallied (see question one). The percentages of regulations from each state for each section of HEAPE were tallied. For example, in the Health section there was a total of 26 regulations. The State of

Wisconsin will be used as an example throughout the following paragraphs. The State of Wisconsin chose twenty-seven percent of those regulations. In the Education section there is a total of fourteen regulations and Wisconsin chose twenty-nine percent of those regulations. In the Abilities section there was a total of twenty-seven regulations and Wisconsin chose seven percent of those regulations. In the Personality section there was a total of forty-three regulations and Wisconsin chose five percent of them. In the Extraneous sevtion there was a total of nine regulations and Wisconsin chose eleven percent of them. For the State of Wisconsin there was an order of importance for each section of HEAPE; first there was Education; then Health; Extraneous, Abilities and Personality. The HEAPE section sections were ordered, going from the greatest percentage to the least. The greater the percentage, the greater the importance assigned by the state to the regulation.

In order to obtain a picture of where all the states stood in relation to each section of HEAPE, the percentages from each state for each section of HEAPE were organized into five ranks; 0% to 10% = 1; 10% to 20% = 2; 20% to 30% = 3; 30% to 40% = 4; 40% to 50% = 5. For example, the percentage of regulations chosen by Wisconsin from the twenty-six regulations in the Health section was ranked as three (27%). These new ranks were summed for each section of HEAPE. For Health, the sum total was 155; for Education, the sum total was 111; for Ability, the sum total was 72; for Personality, the sum total was 75; for Extraneous, the sum total was 87. A mean percentage rank was made for each section of HEAPE; Health = 3.04; Education = 2.18; Ability = 1.41;

Personality = 1.47; and Extraneous = 1.71. The results are indicated in the following order of priority, starting with that general area considered most important by all the states and proceeding to the least: Health
Education
Extraneous
Personality
Ability

The acronym HEAPE shifts to HEEPA. For a summary of the data for answering question three, see Tables VII and VIII.

The fourth question was:

4) How does each state perceive the personality of the day care teacher?

The question number four was answered by looking at the Personality section from the National HEAPE Survey. The Personality section lists all the personality traits and which states chose them. No two states follow the same pattern of day care teacher personality traits. For example, the State of Wisconsin requires a day care teacher to be Emotionally Mature and have Good Integrity; whereas, the State of Florida requires that a day care teacher have No Bad Habits and be of Good Character. There are some states that did not require any personality traits such as California, Iowa, and Rhode Island. For a summary of the information in answering question four, see Table IV.

The fifth question was:

5) In summing the personality characteristics from all fifty states, is there a set of personality traits that surfaces?

Question five was answered by looking at the data established in the second question (see Table VI). The regulations for the Personality section were arranged in question two so that each regulation is

presented along with the number and percentage of states that chose that particular regulation. The seven personality traits that were chosen most frequently are listed as follows, starting with the trait most frequently chosen and descending to the least:

PERSONALITY TRAIT	# OF STATES CHOOSING THE TRAIT
Good Character	24
Understanding	18
Emotional Maturity	12
Warm Feeling For Children	9
Interest in Children	8
Flexible	8
Competent	8

One must remember the total number of states is fifty-one. Therefore, Good Character, which was chosen by twenty-four of the states reveals the fact that not even half of the states chose the same personality trait.

A subjective decision was made to make the cutoff point for the above group of seven personality traits at nothing below a trait chosen by at least eight states. For a summary of all these results for question five, see Table VI - Personality.

Chapter IV

DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

Since the veto by President Nixon of the "Comprehensive Child Development bill" in 1971, day care as a subject raised a number of questions. A possible source for answers might be the state day care regulations in each state.

In order to establish a firm understanding of day care and its regulations a brief historical sketch was completed. It was concluded from the historical sketch that existing policies and practices in day care could be described by the term used by Pamela Roby as a "nonsystem" (1973, p. 134).

Since state regulations are critical in the day care business, surveys of state regulations were reviewed. Given adequate survey data, it was decided that the next step in analysis should be a more microscopic view of these state day care regulations. In order of importance, the first area of the state day care regulations needing a more careful scrutiny was the day care teacher and his/her personality.

Five questions concerning the day care teacher and his/her personality were addressed:

1) What are the minimal personnel regulations for day care teachers as found in the state day care regulations?

2) Which state day care teacher regulations are considered most important by all the states?

3) What general area of the state day care requirements for teachers do all the states consider most important?

4) How does each state perceive the personality of the day care teacher?

5) In summing the personality characteristics from all fifty-one states is there a set of personality traits that surfaces?

The HEAPE Survey offers a clear picture of where each state stands in regulating day care as regards the day care teacher. Two factors emerge grom the HEAPE Survey; one is the question of subjectivity; and the second is the question of variety. Such requirements as Humbly Teachable; Provide Adequate Care; Competent; Reliable; No Bad Habits, and others are all too subjective and undefined. From community to community, person to person, individual interpretations could produce chaos and defeat the whole purpose for such regulations. Each person responsible for judging the quality of a day care teacher will end up with a different interpretation of the requirements. Perhaps a method for mitigating the individual interpretations should be for state-wide meetings held two or more times a year, where the day care regulations and the states' interpretations for these regulations could be disseminated and updated frequently.

The second factor of interest here is the variety of regulations. The variety of regulations exhibited in the HEAPE Survey reveals the lack of agreement as to what constitutes minimal regulations for a quality day care teacher. The solution to this problem could be the establishment of the state day care teacher regulations on research-based information. This would help eliminate day care requirements that are vague, impossible to define, and unnecessary. This solution would also help reduce subjectivity and excessive reliance on regulatory agents' judgements.

The answer to question number two raises some interesting points.

The most important day care regulations as agreed upon by all the states are: a Physical; a High School Degree; the Ability to be Nonpunitive with Out-of-bounds Behavior; and finally Good Character. All five of these regulations tend to be all-encompassing. A physical could and many times does include both an examination of the individuals physical stability as well as his/her mental stability. In fact, several states indicate this dual examination in their regulations. The High School Degree as a regulation, can include such regulations as Able to Read and Write; Course in Early Childhood Education; and Experience. If the move is made to make college the education regulation, then the quantity of day care teachers would drop drastically, and if the move is made to go below the High School Degree level, then fewer assumptions can be made about the teacher.

The Ability to be Firm but Nonpunitive with Out-of-bounds Behavior, as a regulation, is not as all-encompassing as the other four leading regulations. However, there are several important implications; the form and extent of discipline allowed; the mental stability of the day care teacher; and his/her flexibility, adaptibility, patience, and understanding. Good Character as an important regulation, provides broad coverage. All of the Personality and some of the Extraneous regulations could fall under this regulation. Character Reference as an important regulation, likewise can absorb many of the other regulations. The problem stemming from these somewhat all-inclusive regulations is again the question of individual interpretation. Elizabeth Prescott (1967) presents a case history, where one licensing agent allowed a day care center to operate and thrive flexibly around

the day care regulations; but when a new agent was assigned to the center, the interpretations of the state day care regulations became so narrow and inflexible, that the day care center was on its way to closing down entirely.

While the personality of the day care teacher was purported to be the most important aspect of the day care teacher, the results from the National HEAPE Survey for answering question number three, indicated that the states on the whole failed to recognize it as such (Pitcher, 1968; Jersild, 1960; Reichenberg-Hackett, 1962). The order of importance for the most important general area of day care teacher requirements as determined by the states starting with the most important is Health; then Education; Extraneous; Personality; and Ability. Health regulations dominated all the other sections of HEAPE. There are two possible explanations for this: the first is that at the beginning of this century, good health care for children was seriously lacking and therefore, health care was deemed the immediate priority; the second explanation is that many of the state day care requirements were assembled quickly, by modeling the standards and requirements already established for hospitals and restaurants (Day Care and Child Development Council of America, 1970, p. 1). This method also made the whole procedure relatively easy to do.

Peesonality holds fourth place in this grouping. There are two possible explanations: one, the health and education of the teacher have dominated because of the importance and influence associated with these institutions; and two, the personality has been in the hands of the psychologist and researcher with few major breakthroughs.

Question four was answered by looking at the Personality section of the HEAPE Survey. Again, the minimal importance associated with personality is brought out by the various states. No two states follow the same pattern for personality regulations. These differences could be reflected by the cultural and geographical variations from state to state.

A set of personality traits does surface from the summing of all the personality characteristics from all the states. The more times that states chose a personality trait, the more importance was added to the regulation. Starting with the personality trait that was chosen most frequently by the states and proceeding to the least, the list is as follows:

PERSONALITY TRAIT	# OF STATES CHOOSING THE TRAIT
Good Character	24
Understanding	18
Emotional Maturity	12
Warm Feeling for Children	9
Interest in Children	8
Flexible	8
Competent	8

The number of states choosing a personality trait is important to remember since not even half of the states could reach common agreement on choosing a personality trait.

What is interesting in these results is the relationship of the survey data above and the research-based personality traits mentioned in the introduction. These research-based personality traits are aligned with the personality importance data above:

RESEARCHED PERSONALITY TRAITS	HEAPE PERSONALITY TRAITS	# OF STATES CHOOSING THAT TRAIT
Understanding (Ryan, 1964)	Understanding	18

Emotional Warmth (Eisenberg and Conners, 1966)	Warm Feeling For Children	9
Sensitivity (Ryan, 1964)	Sensitive	7
Responsiveness (Ryan, 1964)	None	0
Flexibility (Harvey, et al, 1966)	Flexibility	8
A Willingness to Allow Children to Express Their Feelings, Behavior, Independence and Creativity (Flanders, 1964)	Patience	4
	Respect for Children and Adults	2
	Cooperative	5
	Good Temperament	5

Even if a state recognized and required these research established personality traits for the day care teacher, as mentioned above, the states are still faced with the problem of screening for these particular traits. When individual walks into the day care director's office and hands over a resume indicating a college degree with a major in early childhood education (ECE) and a history of participation and collaboration in ECE, should the director accept these given data as valid in determining whether or not to hire this person as a day care teacher? Since the personality of the day care teacher determines to a large extent the quality of the individual's care for the children then there should be some independent, valid indicators of the various personality traits held by this particular individual. There are three possible routes open to this fictitious director: one, the director can contact past employers and/or teachers who could delineate the personality traits of the potential teacher; two, the director could hire the the teacher for a temporary period, (for example, six months) and then proceed to observe the teacher at work noting any revealed personality traits; and three, the director could administer a personality inventory to the potential teacher and obtain in a relatively clear fashion, a

personality outline. Actually, there arises a fourth choice for the director, the natural outgrowth from the three choices mentioned above, and that is to follow all three. However, for practical and economic reasons, the fourth route would be too costly. The least costly and most attractive route, is route number three. Establishing the most accurate, valid and reliable measurement system for assessing personality currently appears to not yet be in our grasp. The answer to this problem seems to reside with continued research.

After viewing all the material presented thus far, concerning the study of day care teacher requirements, is there some way to establish a set of sound day care teacher requirements? According to Biddle (1964), Eisner (1963), Flanders (1964), and Johnson (1969), the complexity of this problem prohibits any agreement upon what factors describe the competent teacher. Broudy (1969) concludes that good teaching could be defined any way we like. In 1969, Burdin and Lauzillotti determined that "it is not possible to go very far in specifying the knowledge, skills, and sensitivities that prospective teachers need," (p. 61). Donald Peters and Margaret McNichol have indicated that "the community people may, as the ultimate consumers, provide an important and clear statement of the performances they expect from early childhood personnel at various levels," (1973, p. 8).

The state day care regulations can be seen as a pool of information. The five questions from this study represents only the beginning of a vast amount of questions yet to be analyzed in terms of this survey data. There are three projects that will immediately follow up this current study. The first will be to see whether or not the personality section

of the National HEAPE Survey is acceptable or not to both day care teachers and to the parents of the children in the day care centers. The second project will involve the administration of a personality inventory to local day care teachers (ideally on a national basis) to find out what the day care teachers' personality actually is. And the third project would evolve from project two, which would be to determine whether the day care teacher's personality varies with geographical location. Such research will be not only necessary but also exciting, informative, and rewarding.

TABLES I to V

There are four steps involved in completing this table;

1) The state day care regulations for teachers were extracted from the day care licensing manuals from each of the fifty states;

2) They were organized into five categories designed by the investigator, namely Health, Education, Abilities, Personality, and Extraneous;

3) The states and Washington, D.C. were alphabetized and listed along the ordinate scale, while the day care teacher requirements having been organized into the five sections HEAPE, were placed on the abscissa;

4) An X was placed in a box wherever the state day care teacher regulation intersected with the particular state.

TABLE I - HEALTH

	I				II						III		IV			
		FREQUENCE OF PHYSICAL			FREEDOM FROM PHYSICAL DISABILITY											
	MEDICAL RE-QUIRED	ANNUAL		OTHER	PHYSICALLY STRONG	MENTALLY	BLINDNESS	DEAFNESS	EPILEPSY		NO DRUG ADDICTION	NO ALCOHOLISM	MENTALLY STABLE	EMOTIONALLY STABLE	NOT DANGEROUSLY ILL, MENTALLY	NOT MENTALLY RETARDED
ALABAMA	X	X			X								X	X		
ALASKA	X	X			X						X	X	X	X		
ARIZONA	X				X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X		
ARKANSAS	X				X								X			
CALIFORNIA	X			X												
COLORADO	X	X			X								X			
CONNECTICUT	X	X			X	X								X		
DELAWARE	X	X														
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	X	X														
FLORIDA	X			X												
GEORGIA	X	X			X								X	X		
HAWAII	X	X			X								X	X		
IDAHO					X		X						X			
ILLINOIS	X	X			X								X	X		
INDIANA	X	X			X								X	X		
IOWA	X	X			X								X			
KANSAS	X			X	X								X			
KENTUCKY	X			X	X								X			
LOUISIANA	X	X			X								X	X		
MAINE	X	X			X								X	X		
MARYLAND																
MASSACHUSETTS	X				X								X			
MICHIGAN	X	X												X		
MINNESOTA	X	X			X						X	X	X			
MISSISSIPPI	X	X			X								X			
MISSOURI	X				X								X			
MONTANA	X			X	X								X			
NEBRASKA	X				X								X			
NEVADA	X													X		
NEW HAMPSHIRE	X	X														
NEW JERSEY	X	X														
NEW MEXICO	X	X			X								X			
NEW YORK	X	X			X						X	X	X	X	X	X
NORTH CAROLINA	X	X			X								X			
NORTH DAKOTA	X	X			X								X			
OHIO	X	X			X									X		
OKLAHOMA					X											
OREGON																
PENNSYLVANIA	X	X			X								X			
RHODE ISLAND	X	X											X			
SOUTH CAROLINA	X	X			X								X	X		
SOUTH DAKOTA	X	X			X									X		
TENNESSEE	X	X											X			
TEXAS	X	X			X								X			
UTAH	X	X			X									X		
VERMONT	X	X			X									X		
VIRGINIA	X	X			X								X	X		
WASHINGTON					X											
WEST VIRGINIA	X	X												X		
WISCONSIN	X	X			X											
WYOMING	X	X			X						X	X	X			

V

VI

FREEDOM FROM DISEASES DETRIMENTAL TO	FREEDOM FROM COMMUNICABLE DISEASES	FREEDOM FROM COLDS AND FLU'S	STRONG IMMUNE SYSTEM	IMMUNIZATION AGAINST DIPTHERIA	SMALL POX VACCINATION	POLIOMYELITIS VACCINATION	TYPHOID TEST	TUBERCULOSIS TEST	FREQUENCY OF TB TEST: ANNUAL	FREQUENCY OF TB TEST: OTHER	STOOL EXAM FOR PARASITES
X	X		X					X	X		X
X X	X X							X X			
	X X							X			
	X	X						X			
X								X	X		
								X		X	
X								X	X		
								X	X		
X	X							X			
X	X	X						X	X		
								X			
	X			X	X	X		X	X		
X	X X							X X			
	X							X			
X		X						X	X		
X X	X	X						X			
X	X	X					X	X X	X		
								X		X	
	X							X			
X		X					X	X	X		
	X		X					X	X		
	X										
								X			
	X							X	X		
	X							X	X		
X X	X	X			X			X	X		
X X	X							X	X		
X X	X							X	X		
	X		X					X			
X								X	X		
X	X				X			X			
X	X							X	X		
X	X		X					X	X		
X	X							X	X		
	X							X	X		
X	X							X		X	
X		X						X			
X X								X	X		
X								X	X		

TABLE II - EDUCATION

	I		II			III					IV				
	CERTIFICATION AS A CHILD DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATE	TEACHERS CERTIFICATE	EXPERIENCE	CONTINUING EDUCATION	INSERVICE TRAINING	ABLE TO READ AND WRITE	HIGH SCHOOL DEGREE	SOME HIGH SCHOOL	COLLEGE DEGREE	SOME COLLEGE	PROPER TRAINING	FORMAL AND INFORMAL TRAINING IN HUMAN DEVELOPMENT	AND PRESCHOOL EDUCATION		
ALABAMA					X		X	X							
ALASKA	X						X		X	X		X			
ARIZONA															
ARKANSAS							X				X				
CALIFORNIA							X								
COLORADO							X								
CONNECTICUT			X	X			X								
DELAWARE															
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA											X				
FLORIDA					X		X				X				
GEORGIA					X				X	X					
HAWAII															
IDAHO							X			X					X
ILLINOIS			X												X
INDIANA				X	X		X				X				
IOWA							X								
KANSAS				X	X										
KENTUCKY						X			X						
LOUISIANA															
MAINE				X	X		X								X
MARYLAND				X			X								X
MASSACHUSETTS				X			X								
MICHIGAN									X	X					
MINNESOTA			X		X		X				X				
MISSISSIPPI			X							X					
MISSOURI															
MONTANA									X					X	
NEBRASKA					X										X
NEVADA					X	X									
NEW HAMPSHIRE				X			X								
NEW JERSEY		X						X	X	X					X
NEW MEXICO															
NEW YORK			X				X								
NORTH CAROLINA				X											
NORTH DAKOTA															
OHIO							X				X				
OKLAHOMA			X	X			X			X	X				
OREGON			X							X					
PENNSYLVANIA			X	X			X								
RHODE ISLAND			X		X		X		X	X					
SOUTH CAROLINA															
SOUTH DAKOTA			X		X		X		X		X				
TENNESSEE			X				X		X		X				
TEXAS			X		X		X								
UTAH															
VERMONT											X				
VIRGINIA			X				X								
WASHINGTON					X										
WEST VIRGINIA			X				X								X
WISCONSIN			X		X		X								
WYOMING				X	X										

TABLE III - ABILITY

	I		II		III			IV			V	
	ABLE TO INTERACT WITH CHILDREN	SUITABLE TO WORK WITH CHILDREN	HAVE ABILITIES, APTITUDES, AND MOTIVATION	RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING AND CARRYING OUT THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM	ABLE TO RESPONSIBLY SUPERVISE	ABLE TO TAKE CHARGE	ABLE TO KEEP CHILDREN'S RECORDS	ABLE TO ENCOURAGE CHILDREN	ABLE TO PRAISE CHILDREN	ABLE TO MAINTAIN CONSISTENCY IN BEHAVIOR TOWARDS CHILDREN	HUMBLY TEACHABLE	WILLING TO LEARN
ALABAMA												
ALASKA	X							X	X	X		X
ARIZONA		X										
ARKANSAS										X		
CALIFORNIA										X		
COLORADO												
CONNECTICUT	X				X							
DELAWARE												
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA												
FLORIDA		X			X							
GEORGIA												
HAWAII				X			X			X		X
IDAHO												
ILLINOIS			X		X							
INDIANA												
IOWA												
KANSAS												X
KENTUCKY		X			X							
LOUISIANA												X
MAINE										X		
MARYLAND												
MASSACHUSETTS												
MICHIGAN		X			X						X	
MINNESOTA												
MISSISSIPPI	X											
MISSOURI												
MONTANA										X		X
NEBRASKA										X		
NEVADA												
NEW HAMPSHIRE												
NEW JERSEY												
NEW MEXICO												
NEW YORK												
NORTH CAROLINA												
NORTH DAKOTA												
OHIO												
OKLAHOMA												
OREGON						X						
PENNSYLVANIA												
RHODE ISLAND												
SOUTH CAROLINA					X							
SOUTH DAKOTA												
TENNESSEE												X
TEXAS												
UTAH												
VERMONT										X		
VIRGINIA												X
WASHINGTON												X
WEST VIRGINIA												
WISCONSIN		X										
WYOMING												

| | VI | | | | | VII | | | | |

TABLE IV - PERSONALITY

	I	II	III		IV		V			VI			VII			VIII				
	INTELLIGENT	SELF-AWARENESS	SECURE	PATIENCE	UNDERSTANDING	MATURE	EMOTIONAL MATURITY	WARM FEELING FOR CHILDREN	ENJOYS CHILDREN	RESPECT FOR CHILDREN AND ADULTS	SPONTANEITY	FLEXIBLE	COOPERATIVE	ADAPTABLE	EMPATHETIC	AFFECTIONATE	SENSITIVE	ENTHUSIASTIC	SYMPATHETIC	SENSE OF HUMOR	HAPPY	GOOD TEMPERAMENT	FRIENDLY	CREATIVE
ALABAMA				X	X																			
ALASKA					X			X								X								
ARIZONA																								
ARKANSAS																						X		
CALIFORNIA																								
COLORADO																								
CONNECTICUT						X		X				X	X		X			X			X			
DELAWARE	X				X		X	X											Y					
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA																								
FLORIDA																								
GEORGIA					X																			
HAWAII					X	X		X						X	X									
IDAHO																								
ILLINOIS		X	X	X	X		X		X	X		X	X			X				X				X
INDIANA																								
IOWA																								
KANSAS					X		X						X				X							
KENTUCKY				X	X	X				X		X	X			X						X		
LOUISIANA																								X
MAINE	X				X				X			X					X							
MARYLAND																								
MASSACHUSETTS					X	X	X										Y							
MICHIGAN								X			X	X					Y		Y	X				
MINNESOTA							X																	
MISSISSIPPI																								
MISSOURI					X	X	X	X																
MONTANA												X										X	X	
NEBRASKA								X	X				X			X	Y							
NEVADA					X		X																	
NEW HAMPSHIRE																								
NEW JERSEY																								
NEW MEXICO							X																	
NEW YORK																						X		
NORTH CAROLINA					X				X															
NORTH DAKOTA					X																		X	
OHIO																								
OKLAHOMA												X												
OREGON																								
PENNSYLVANIA																								
RHODE ISLAND																								
SOUTH CAROLINA																								
SOUTH DAKOTA							X																	
TENNESSEE					X																			
TEXAS							X												Y					
UTAH																								
VERMONT					X																	X		
VIRGINIA																	X							
WASHINGTON							X	X																
WEST VIRGINIA				X	X			X				X												
WISCONSIN							X																	
WYOMING					X				X								X							

| IX | | |

TABLE V - EXTRANEOUS

	WORK REFERENCES	CHARACTER REFERENCE	CAN HOLD SECOND JOB ONLY WHEN IT DOES NOT INTERFERE IN THE DAY CARE ACTIVITIES	TEACHERS CANNOT TEACH THEIR OWN CHILDREN	HAVE OUTSIDE INTERESTS	AS DIRECTED BY DIRECTOR	ORIENTATION TO PROGRAM	FINGER PRINT CLEARANCE	FREE FROM PAST CRIMES IN CHILD ABUSE OR MORAL TURPITUDES
ALABAMA									
ALASKA		X							X
ARIZONA									X
ARKANSAS									
CALIFORNIA									
COLORADO		X							
CONNECTICUT					X				
DELAWARE		X							
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA									
FLORIDA		X							
GEORGIA		X							
HAWAII									
IDAHO		X							
ILLINOIS		X	X	X					
INDIANA							X		
IOWA									X
KANSAS	X			X					
KENTUCKY									
LOUISIANA		X							X
MAINE									
MARYLAND									
MASSACHUSETTS									
MICHIGAN									
MINNESOTA		X							X
MISSISSIPPI									
MISSOURI									
MONTANA									
NEBRASKA									
NEVADA							X	X	
NEW HAMPSHIRE									
NEW JERSEY									
NEW MEXICO									
NEW YORK			X						
NORTH CAROLINA									X
NORTH DAKOTA									
OHIO									X
OKLAHOMA									X
OREGON									
PENNSYLVANIA									
RHODE ISLAND									
SOUTH CAROLINA									
SOUTH DAKOTA		X							
TENNESSEE						X			
TEXAS		X							
UTAH									X
VERMONT									
VIRGINIA									
WASHINGTON									
WEST VIRGINIA		X							X
WISCONSIN		X							X
WYOMING		X							X

TABLE VI

There are a number of steps involved in the assembly of Table II. By returning to Table I, the investigator can answer the question "how many states chose a particular state day care teacher requirement? This question is based upon the premise that "the more frequently a state day care teacher requirement is chosen by the various states, the greater is its importance. By taking each state day care teacher requirement, and descending along the ordinate, the total summation for the number of states choosing that particular state day care teacher requirement can be tabulated. Then the state day care teacher requirements were organized on Table II so that they started with the state day care teacher requirement chosen the least number of times, progressing to the one chosen most frequently. For a clearer picture of the data, percentages were calculated for each state day care teacher requirement by dividing the number of states choosing each catagory by the total number of states and Washington, D.C. (51), and then multiplying each of these results by 100.

TABLE VI

'HEALTH

X = NUMBER OF STATES CHOOSING THE CATEGORY
N = TOTAL NUMBER OF STATES AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
$\frac{X}{N} \times 100$ = % OF STATES CHOOSING THE CATEGORY

	X	%
FREEDOM FROM DEAFNESS	1	2
FREEDOM FROM EPILEPSY	1	2
NOT DANGEROUSLY ILL, MENTALLY	1	2
NOT MENTALLY RETARDED	1	2
STOOL EXAM FOR PARASITES	1	2
WEALTHY	1	2
IMMUNIZATION AGAINST DIPTHERIA	1	2
POLIOMYELITIS	1	2
FREEDOM FROM BLINDNESS	2	4
TYPHOID TEST	2	4
FREQUENCY OF TB TEST....OTHER	3	6
SMALL POX VACCINATION	3	6
STRONG IMMUNE SYSTEM	4	8
FREQUENCY OF PHYSICAL....OTHER	5	10
NO DRUG ADDICTION	5	10
NO ALCOHOLISM	5	10
FREEDOM FROM COLDS AND FLU'S	8	16
EMOTIONALLY STABLE	20	39
FREEDOM FROM DISEASES DETRIMENTAL TO CHILDREN	27	53
FREQUENCY OF TB TEST....ANNUAL	28	55
FREEDOM FROM COMMUNICABLE DISEASES	28	55
MENTALLY STABLE	32	63
FREQUENCY OF PHYSICAL....ANNUAL	35	69
PHYSICALLY STRONG	38	75
TUBERCULOSIS TEST	44	86
PHYSICAL REQUIRED	46	90

TABLE VI

EDUCATION

X = NUMBER OF STATES CHOOSING THE CATEGORY
N = TOTAL NUMBER OF STATES AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (N = 51)
$\frac{X}{N}$ x 100 = % OF STATES CHOOSING THE CATEGORY

	X	%
TEACHERS CERTIFICATE	1	2
KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING OF EARLY CHILDHOOD AND PRESCHOOL EDUCATION	1	2
FORMAL AND INFORMAL TRAINING IN HUMAN DEVELOPMENT	1	2
CERTIFICATION AS A CHILD DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATE	1	2
SOME HIGH SCHOOL	2	4
ABLE TO READ AND WRITE	2	4
COURSE IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION	7	14
COLLEGE DEGREE	9	18
SOME COLLEGE	9	18
PROPER TRAINING	10	20
CONTINUING EDUCATION	11	22
EXPERIENCE	15	29
INSERVICE TRAINING	15	29
HIGH SCHOOL DEGREE	28	55

TABLE VI

ABILITIES

X = NUMBER OF STATES CHOOSING THE CATEGORY
N = TOTAL NUMBER OF STATES AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (N = 51)
$\frac{X}{N} \times 100$ = % OF STATES CHOOSING THE CATEGORY

	X	%
ABLE TO PRAISE CHILDREN	1	2
ABLE TO ENCOURAGE CHILDREN	1	2
PROVIDE ACTIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT	1	2
RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING AND CARRING OUT THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM	1	2
ABLE TO PROVIDE CREATIVE AND ENRICHED LEARNING	1	2
HUMBLY TEACHABLE	1	2
PROVIDE HUMANE CARE	1	2
ABLE TO TAKE CHARGE	1	2
ABLE TO KEEP CHILDREN'S RECORDS	1	2
HAVE ABILITIES, APTITUDES, AND MOTIVATION	1	2
ABLE TO ACCEPT CHILD'S EXPRESSION OF STRONG FEELINGS	1	2
ABLE TO PROVIDE GOOD PHYSICAL CARE	1	2
PROTECTIVE OF CHILDREN	1	2
RESPONSIBLE FOR CHILD GUIDANCE	2	4
ABLE TO GIVE CHILD FEELING OF SECURITY AND COMFORT	2	4
ABLE TO ACCEPT SUPERVISION	3	6
ABLE TO INTERACT WITH CHILDREN	3	6
PROVIDE ADEQUATE CARE	4	8
ABLE TO PROVIDE MENTAL, EMOTIONAL, AND SOCIAL NEEDS	4	8
PROVIDE SAFE CARE	5	10
SUITABLE TO WORK WITH CHILDREN	5	10
ABLE TO RESPONSIBLY SUPERVISE	6	12
WILLING TO LEARN	7	14
ABLE TO MAINTAIN CONSISTANCY IN BEHAVIOR TOWARDS CHILDREN	8	15

TABLE VI

ABILITIES CONTINUED

	X	X
ABLE TO STIMULATE NORMAL DEVELOPMENT	10	20
ABLE TO ACCEPT DIFFERENCES AMONGST CHILDREN	11	22
ABLE TO BE FIRM BUT NON-PUNITIVE WITH OUT-OF-BOUNDS BEHAVIOR	12	24

TABLE VI

PERSONALITY

X = NUMBER OF STATES CHOOSING THE CATEGORY
N = TOTAL NUMBER OF STATES AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (N = 51)
$\frac{X}{N} \times 100$ = % OF STATES CHOOSING THE CATEGORY

	X	%
HAPPY	1	2
SECURE	1	2
ADAPTABLE	1	2
SPONTANEITY	1	2
HAVE VALUES	1	2
EMPATHETIC	1	2
SENSE OF ORDERLINESS	1	2
SELF-AWARENESS	1	2
ENTHUSIASTIC	1	2
OBJECTIVE	2	4
FRIENDLY	2	4
RESOURCEFUL	2	4
INTELLIGENT	2	4
EFFECTIVE	2	4
GOOD INTEGRITY	2	4
SENSE OF HUMOR	2	4
RESPECT FOR CHILDREN AND ADULTS	2	4
RELIABLE	3	6
SYMPATHETIC	3	6
NO BAD HABITS	3	6
CREATIVE	4	8
PATIENCE	4	8
AFFECTIONATE	4	8
MATURE	5	10
DEPENDABLE	5	10
COOPERATIVE	5	10

TABLE VI

PERSONALITY CONTINUED

	X	%
GOOD TEMPERAMENT	5	10
WHOLESOME PERSONALITY	5	10
GOOD REPUTATION	5	10
ENJOYS CHILDREN	5	10
PERSONAL QUALITIES	6	12
RESPONSIBLE	7	14
SENSITIVE	7	14
GOOD MORALS	7	14
SOUND JUDGEMENT	7	14
LIKES CHILDREN	7	14
COMPETANT	8	16
FLEXIBLE	8	16
INTEREST IN CHILDREN	8	16
WARM FEELING FOR CHILDREN	9	18
EMOTIONAL MATURITY	12	24
UNDERSTANDING	18	35
GOOD CHARACTER	24	47

TABLE VI

EXTRANEOUS

X = NUMBER OF STATES CHOOSING THE CATEGORY
N = TOTAL NUMBER OF STATES AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (N = 51)

$\frac{X}{N}$ x 100 = % OF STATES CHOOSING THE CATEGORY

	X	%
WORK REFERENCES	1	2
AS DIRECTED BY DIRECTOR	1	2
HAVE OUTSIDE INTEREST	1	2
FINGER PRINT CLEARANCE	1	2
CAN HOLD SECOND JOB ONLY WHEN IT DOES NOT INTERFERE IN THE DAY CARE ACTIVITIES	2	4
ORIENTATION TO PROGRAM	2	4
TEACHERS CANNOT TEACH THEIR OWN CHILDREN	2	4
FREE FROM PAST CRIMES IN CHILD ABUSE OR MORAL TURPITUDES	12	24
CHARACTER REFERENCE	14	28

TABLE VII

In looking at all the state day care teacher requirements, the question arises as to how many of the state day care teacher requirements were chosen by each state out of the total number of state day care teacher requirements. This question can be solved in three steps:

1) All the state day care teacher requirements for each catagory of HEAPE were summed;

2) Next is the taking of each state individually and adding up the number of times it intersects with each state day care teacher requirement in the particular subcatagory of HEAPE;

3) By dividing the latter by the former and multiplying the resultant by 100, the percentage can be obtained for each state.

By placing the percentage obtained for each catagory along side the next, one can see, in percentages, where each state focuses its greatest concern.

TABLE VII

X = NUMBER OF STATE CATEGORIES CHOSEN
N = TOTAL NUMBER OF CATEGORIES
$\frac{X}{N} \times 100$ = % OF CATEGORIES CHOSEN BY THE STATE

	N = 26 HEALTH	N = 14 EDUCATION	N = 27 ABILITIES	N = 43 PERSONALITY	N = 9 EXTRANEOUS
	%	%	%	%	%
ALABAMA	42	21	0	5	0
ALASKA	38	36	41	16	22
ARIZONA	46	0	7	5	11
ARKANSAS	19	7	4	0	0
CALIFORNIA	19	14	4	0	0
COLORADO	27	7	4	0	11
CONNECTICUT	27	21	11	23	11
DELAWARE	19	7	0	12	11
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	15	0	0	2	0
FLORIDA	23	7	15	5	11
GEORGIA	31	21	0	7	11
HAWAII	27	21	19	14	0
IDAHO	12	0	0	5	11
ILLINOIS	42	29	22	37	33
INDIANA	35	14	4	12	11
IOWA	19	7	0	0	11
KANSAS	27	21	15	14	22
KENTUCKY	27	14	15	23	0
LOUISIANA	35	0	11	2	22
MAINE	42	21	15	28	0
MARYLAND	4	21	0	0	0
MASSACHUSETTS	23	21	7	16	0
MICHIGAN	31	14	26	23	0
MINNESOTA	38	29	0	12	22
MISSISSIPPI	23	14	4	2	0
MISSOURI	12	0	4	19	0
MONTANA	15	0	15	7	0
NEBRASKA	23	21	15	16	0
NEVADA	19	21	0	7	22
NEW HAMPSHIRE	15	14	0	0	0
NEW JERSEY	15	29	0	0	0
NEW MEXICO	27	7	11	9	0
NEW YORK	38	14	0	5	11
NORTH CAROLINA	50	7	0	16	11
NORTH DAKOTA	31	0	0	2	0
OHIO	31	14	0	0	11
OKLAHOMA	8	36	7	7	11
OREGON	8	14	4	5	0
PENNSYLVANIA	27	21	0	5	0
RHODE ISLAND	19	36	4	0	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	27	0	11	2	0
SOUTH DAKOTA	27	36	0	5	11
TENNESSEE	23	29	15	9	11
TEXAS	35	21	0	9	22
UTAH	15	0	0	7	0
VERMONT	31	7	4	7	0
VIRGINIA	27	14	7	2	0
WASHINGTON	27	7	4	12	11
WEST VIRGINIA	15	14	15	14	22
WISCONSIN	27	29	7	5	11
WYOMING	15	14	7	16	22

Table V was formulated by ranking the percentages from Table III into five ranks; 0% to 10% = 1; 10% to 20% = 2; 20% to 30% = 3; 30% to 40% = 4; 40% to 50% = 5. These ranks are listed on the ordinate and the HEAPE catagories are listed on the horizontal.

TABLE VIII

	HEALTH	EDUCATION	ABILITY	PERSONALITY	EXTRANEOUS
1	1 x 3 = 3	1 x 18 = 18	1 x 35 = 35	1 x 33 = 33	1 x 25 = 25
2	2 x 14 = 28	2 x 11 = 22	2 x 13 = 26	2 x 13 = 26	2 x 17 = 34
3	3 x 17 = 51	3 x 17 = 51	3 x 2 = 6	3 x 4 = 12	3 x 8 = 24
4	4 x 12 = 48	4 x 5 = 20	4 x 0 = 0	4 x 1 = 4	4 x 1 = 4
5	5 x 5 = 25	5 x 0 = 0	5 x 1 = 5	5 x 0 = 0	5 x 0 = 0
TOTAL	155	111	72	75	87
MEAN PERCENTAGE RANK	3.04	2.18	1.41	1.47	1.71

REFERENCES

Addams, Jane. Twenty years at hull house. N.Y.:The MacMillan Company, 1910, p. 169.

America's Children, 1976.

Beer, Ethyl S. Working mothers and the day nursery, Pp. 35-40; cf. Robert H. Bremner, Ed., Children and Youth in America: A documentary History, 3 Volumes. Cambridge, Mass.:Harvard University Press, 1970.

_____The day nursery. Social science, October, 1942.

Biddle, B. The integration of teacher effectiveness research. In B Biddle and W. Ellena (Eds.), Contemporary research on teacher effectiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Broudy, H. Criteria for the professional preparation of teacher. Journal of Teacher Education, 1965, 16, 408-15.

Burden, J. and Lanzillotti, K. A reader's guide to the comprehensive models for preparing elementary teachers. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 1969.

Central Midwestern Regional Educational Lab. A comparison of provisions in state and federal standard for institutional day care. 1972.

Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Spotlight on day care. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc. A survey of state day care licensing requirements. 1971.

Class, Norris E. Basic issues in day care licensing. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare Office of Education. 1972.

_____Licensing of child care facilities by state welfare departments: A conceptual statement. Superintendent of documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1968.

Eisenberg,L., and Conners, C.K. The effect of Headstart on developmental processes. Baltimore, Md.: John Hopkins University, 1966.

Eisner, E. Qualitative intelligence and the act of teaching. Elementary School Journal. 1963, 63, 299-307.

Employment in war work of women with young children. Monthly Labor Review, Dec., 1942, p. 1184.

Fein, Greta G., and Clarke-Stewart, Alison. Day care in context. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1973,p.242.

Flanders, N.A. Some relationships among teacher influence, pupil attitudes, and achievement. In B.J. Biddle, and W.J. Ellena (Eds.), Contemporary research on teacher effectiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964, Pp. 196-231.

Franke, Patricia. Personal interview, unpublished. 1976.

Harvey, O.J., Prather, M.S., White, B.J., & Alter, R.D. Teachers belief systems and preschool atmospheres. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1966, 57, Pp. 373-381.

Hollick, Rosemary and others. A review of federal and state regulations for day care programs and facilities. Center for Human Services, Development Report No. 10, Pennsylvania State University, University Park College of Human Development. 1972.

Jersild, A.T. Child psychology. (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1960.

Johnson, D. Influences on teacher's acceptance of change. Elementary School Journal, 1969, 70, Pp.142-153.

Jones, E. Curriculum planning in early childhood education. In L.L. Dittman (Ed.), Curriculum is what happens. Washington,D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children,1970,Pp4-6.

Kerr, Virginia. One step forward, two steps backward. Pamela Roby, (Ed.), Child care - who cares? Basic Books, Inc., N.Y.,N.Y.,1973.

Kuhn, A. L. The mothers role in childhood education. New England concepts 1830-1860. New Haven, Conn.:Yale University Press, 1947.

Laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, No. 30, Section 2.

National Society for the Study of Education. Preschool and Parental Education, 28th Yearbook, Bloomington, Ill.:Public School Publishing Company, 1929.

Office of Child Development (DHEW). Abstract of state day care licensing requirements. Part 2: day care centers. 1971.

Peters, Donald, and McNichol, Margaret. The training and certification of early childhood personnel. Pennsylvania State University, 1973.

Pierce-Jones,J., and Strodtbeck, R. Cited in R.A. O'Brian & P. Lopate, Preschool programs and the intellectual development of disadvantaged children. Urbana, Ill.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education, 1968. (ED 024 473).

Pitcher, E.G. An evaluation of the Montessori method in schools for young children. In J.L. Frost, Ed., Early childhood education rediscovered. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968, Pp. 92-96.

Prescott, Elizabeth, Milich, Cynthia, and Jones, Elizabeth. Group day care: A study in diversity. Pasadena California: Pacific Oaks College, 1969, p. 26.

_____, Jones, E., & Kritchevsky, S. Group day care as a childrearing environment. Unpublished manuscript, Pacific Oaks College, Pasadena, California, 1967, (ERIC NO. ED 924 453).

Reichenberg-Hackett, W. Practices, attitudes and values in nursery group education. Psychological Reports, 1962, 19, Pp. 151-172.

Roby, Pamela, Ed. Child care - who care? Basic Books, Inc., N.Y., N.Y., 1973.

_____Child care - who cares? Student Edition, 1976.

Ryans, D.G. Research on teacher behavior in the context of the teacher characteristics study. In B.J. Biddle and W.J. Ellena (Eds.), Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1964, Pp. 67-101.

Schottland, Charles I. Public Welfare. In Social Work Yearbook. 1957, N.Y., N.Y. National Association of Social Work, 1957, p. 473.

Sears, P.S., & Hilgard, E.R. The teacher's role in the motivation of the learner. In Theories of learning and instruction, Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964, Pp. 202-207.

Spaulding, R.L. Achievement, creativity, and self-concept correlates of teacher-pupil transactions in elementary schools. In C.B. Stendler (Ed.), Readings in child development and behavior. (2nd ed.) New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964. Pp. 313-318.

Swift, J.W. Effects of early groups experience: The nursery school and day nursery. In M.L. Hoffman & L.W. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of child development research, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964. Pp. 249-280.

The story of the white house conferences on children and youth. U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare Social and Rehabilitation Service. U.S. Children's Bureau, 1967, p. 1.

White House Conference on Child Health and Protection. Report from the committee on the infant and preschool child, Section III. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1931, p. 10.

APPENDIX A

List of States that established a Board of State Charities charged with supervision of all public charitable activities of local communities.

Each state is listed according to the year that they initiated a Board of State Charities.

STATE	YEAR
Massachusetts	1863
New York	1867
Ohio	1867
Illinois	1869
North Carolina	1869
Pennsylvania	1869
Rhode Island	1869
Michigan	1871
Wisconsin	1871
Connecticut	1873
Kansas	1873